

Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessments (RESEA): *Promising Reemployment Assistance Interventions*

Report to Congress

The Department of Labor (Department) submits the following report on the Reemployment Services Eligibility Assessment (RESEA) program to Congress. Section 30206(b) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (BBA), Public Law 115-123, requires the Department report on the promising interventions used by states to provide reemployment assistance. This report provides: (i) information about promising interventions that have been identified to date; (ii) an inventory of potentially promising interventions that require further study; (iii) an outline of recent findings from the Department’s impact evaluation of the Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment (REA) program that are being used to inform current RESEA activities; and (iv) an overview of ongoing efforts by the Department and states to identify, develop, and evaluate other potentially promising interventions.

Background

Since 2005, the Department and participating state agencies have been addressing individual reemployment needs of unemployment compensation (UC) claimants, and working to prevent and detect improper UC payments through the voluntary unemployment insurance (UI) Reemployment Eligibility Assessment (REA) program and its successor, the voluntary RESEA program. Because there is strong evidence that these programs and service delivery strategies are effective, they have been identified by annual RESEA operating guidance as a high priority for the Department. During Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 a total of 49 states and territories participated in the voluntary RESEA program.

The BBA, enacted on February 9, 2018, included amendments to the Social Security Act (SSA) that provided permanent authorization for the RESEA program. The RESEA provisions are contained in Section 30206 of the BBA, enacting new Section 306 of the SSA. Among other changes, section 306(c), SSA, requires states to use RESEA grant funds for interventions that have been demonstrated to be effective at reducing the average number of weeks participants receive UC by improving employment outcomes. Section 306(i), SSA, defines an intervention as “a service delivery strategy for the provision of State reemployment services and eligibility assessment activities.” When identifying promising RESEA interventions, the Department views an intervention to include either the whole RESEA program or any component of it. Although state RESEA programs are generally similar in design, there are variations across states in how specific program components and activities are combined and implemented. For instance, all RESEA programs include a claimant selection component, but may vary in how claimants are selected.

The RESEA program now requires states to implement a tiered evidence structure by requiring states to use evidence-based interventions with a “high” or “moderate” causal evidence rating, and beginning in FY 2023 states must directly link a percentage of their annual RESEA funding to such evidence-based interventions. In instances where causal evidence is not available, states may pilot new interventions on the condition that an evaluation is conducted to identify the extent the interventions might successfully

reduce the number of weeks for which program participants receive UC by improving employment outcomes. Over time, these new impact studies of RESEA interventions will expand the availability of interventions with “high” or “moderate” evidence of effectiveness that states may consider using. Further, this continuously developing and evolving evidence base will contribute to the public workforce system’s broader understanding of what reemployment interventions work well, for whom, and in what contexts.

Promising Reemployment Assistance Interventions

A. Promising interventions to-date include job search assistance, providing reemployment support to claimants identified as most in need of such services, and more meaningful requirements for work search activities.

The Department uses its Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR) to identify existing studies which provide credible evidence that is relevant to the RESEA program.¹ Under its Reemployment topic area, which focuses on interventions designed to promote faster reemployment of UC claimants, CLEAR has reviewed 45 publications published between 1978 and 2018. The review systematically identified and reviewed studies which use causal designs – or impact studies – that aim to identify how a particular intervention changes claimants’ outcomes from what those outcomes would have been without the intervention.^{2,3} From this evidence base, CLEAR identified 37 unique studies of five reemployment interventions that are relevant to the RESEA evidence base. Below are broad descriptions of these promising or potentially promising reemployment interventions and one intervention where more research is needed.

- **REA**, the predecessor to RESEA programs, provided claimants up to three mandatory in-person sessions. This program intervention included an assessment of the claimant’s eligibility for UC, an orientation to the American Job Center and its services, the sharing of labor market information, development of a reemployment plan, and referrals to additional services. Claimants that failed to participate in required services could lose UC.

¹ CLEAR makes research on labor topics more accessible to practitioners, policymakers, researchers, and the public so that evidence can inform policy and program decisions. CLEAR does this by conducting systematic evidence reviews of research and evaluation reports on a variety of labor topics. Find more information about CLEAR on its website: <https://clear.dol.gov/>

² CLEAR’s Reemployment systematic evidence review can be found here: <https://clear.dol.gov/topic-area/reemployment>. CLEAR’s Reemployment topic area synthesis can also be found here: <https://clear.dol.gov/synthesis-report/reemployment-synthesis>.

³The credibility of the evidence from an impact study depends on specifics of how it was designed and carried out. CLEAR has established standards to assess whether a study provides good quality, credible evidence; see CLEAR’s causal evidence guidelines here: <https://clear.dol.gov/reference-documents/causal-evidence-guidelines-version-21>. These study quality standards aim to determine how confident we can be that the study’s findings truly reflect the causal impact of the intervention studied and not some other factor.

- **Job Search Assistance (JSA)** interventions provide claimants assistance and training in job search techniques, including, for example, job search workshops, preparing a resume, and interview training.
- **Profiling** interventions identify claimants at higher risk of exhausting UC and then offer or require enhanced employment services. These services may include an orientation, providing labor market information, and referrals to job search training or resume training workshops. Claimants that fail to participate in required services could lose UC eligibility. Although states have significant discretion in how these profiling interventions are designed and implemented, these interventions may not produce results which discriminate in violation of any Federal or State law or which otherwise unfairly favors some claimants over those similarly situated with respect to their need for reemployment services.⁴
- **More stringent employer contact requirements.** Interventions of this type increase the amount of work search efforts required of claimants to continue receiving UC, strengthen verification of that work search effort, or both.
- **Less stringent employer contact requirements.** Interventions of this type reduce the amount of work search efforts required of claimants to continue receiving UC, loosen verification of work search efforts, or both.

All of these reemployment interventions have been rigorously studied using credible causal research designs, and most of them have at least one impact study of the intervention with favorable findings in UC receipt, employment, and/or earnings outcomes to date. Currently, “less stringent work search requirements” is the only RESEA intervention identified in the literature to date that does not have at least one impact study of it with favorable findings in UC receipt, employment, and/or earnings outcomes.

These five interventions have received RESEA intervention effectiveness ratings from the Department beginning in FY 2020, which are an indicator of how many good quality studies show positive impacts of these interventions at this time; in other words, how promising they might be.⁵ The table in Exhibit 1 illustrates how CLEAR applies the evidence standards for reemployment interventions to the available evidence for these five different types of RESEA interventions.⁶

⁴ For more information on requirements for the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services System, please see Unemployment Insurance Program Letter (UIPL) 41-94: https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=363

⁵ For more information on the Department’s RESEA intervention effectiveness ratings, please see UIPL 01-20: https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?docn=6691.

⁶ Further information on each of the studies, their causal evidence ratings, and their related RESEA intervention effectiveness ratings can be found in CLEAR’s RESEA topic area tab: <https://clear.dol.gov/reemployment-services-and-eligibility-assessments-resea>. Expanding the list of studies under each intervention, CLEAR provides profile summaries of each study, including features of the intervention, study causal evidence ratings, and outcome findings

Exhibit 1. Number of Studies with Impacts on UI and Employment Outcomes, by Promising Reemployment Intervention (Q2 employment impacts) (as of October 2019)

Promising Reemployment Interventions	Number of Studies That Demonstrate...					RESEA Intervention Effectiveness Rating
	Favorable Impacts on UI and Employment		Favorable Impacts on UI only	Favorable Impacts on Employment only	No Favorable Impact	
	$p < .05$	$.05 < p < .10$	$p < .10$	$p < .10$	$p < .10$	
REA	3	0	1	0	3	High
Job search assistance	0	3	9	2	1	Moderate
Profiling	1	1	5	0	1	Moderate
More stringent employer contacts	0	0	3	0	1	Potentially Promising
Less stringent employer contacts	0	0	0	0	2	No Rating
Total	4	4	18	2	8	

The right-most column shows the causal evidence rating of each intervention’s effectiveness, and the middle columns count the number of studies that contribute to each intervention’s rating.⁷ The color-coding identifies those studies that are key to the intervention’s assigned rating. An intervention for which at least two studies show evidence of favorable impact on both UC and employment outcomes would receive a “high” rating (the applicable cells are filled in green).⁸ Interventions for which one study shows evidence of favorable impacts on each outcome domain would receive a “moderate” rating (the applicable cells are filled in yellow).⁹ Interventions for which one study shows evidence of favorable impacts on only one outcome domain would receive a “potentially promising” rating (the applicable cells are filled in red).¹⁰ All interventions identified by CLEAR that do not qualify for any other rating (high, moderate, or potentially promising), receive a designation of “no rating.” Due to the modest size of the evidence base, the ratings in this table ignore any estimated adverse impacts. The

⁷ The RESEA intervention effectiveness ratings are an indicator of how many credible studies show favorable impacts on UI duration and employment outcomes at this time. This rating does not indicate how successful these interventions were at producing other desirable outcomes (such as whether the individual is paid an equal or higher wage at their new job than their previous job) for program participants.

⁸ The ‘high’ RESEA intervention rating relies exclusively on findings from credible studies (i.e., those that receive a high or moderate rating of study quality) identified by CLEAR. Studies’ net impacts on UI and employment outcomes must be statistically significant at the 5% level ($p < .05$).

⁹ The ‘moderate’ RESEA intervention rating relies exclusively on findings from credible studies (i.e., those that receive a high or moderate rating of study quality) identified by CLEAR. Studies’ net impacts on UI and employment outcomes must be statistically significant at the 10% level ($p < .10$).

¹⁰ Interventions that do not qualify for a ‘moderate’ rating may receive a ‘potentially promising’ rating if one study has found statistically significant favorable impacts on either outcome domain. The applicable study need not have a high or moderate quality rating from CLEAR. Studies’ net impacts on UI or employment outcomes must be statistically significant at the 10% level ($p < .10$).

Department anticipates revisiting its RESEA intervention effectiveness standards to include studies that found other than favorable impacts at a later time, as more causal evidence is available.¹¹

It is important to recognize that these promising and potentially promising interventions are broadly defined and often involve partially overlapping services and activities. It is also important to note that there is currently no substantial rigorous evidence on the effectiveness of more detailed components within the broad strategies listed above. In other words, no credible evidence currently exists on the impact of RESEA program components like case management, intensive services, or multiple meetings on participants' outcomes, though the effects of these program components may be part of the net impacts found in the studies of REA or JSA interventions included in Exhibit 1. Additional examples of RESEA program components that require more credible causal evidence can be found below in Exhibit 2.

As new evidence is produced on RESEA interventions – either on states' whole RESEA programs or on specific components of those programs – CLEAR will identify causal studies in subsequent systematic evidence reviews, and provide reviews and ratings for both study quality and intervention effectiveness. As such, the list of rated interventions may change over time and expand to include more highly defined promising reemployment interventions.

B. New studies of the REA program continue to demonstrate its effectiveness, though more information is needed regarding effectiveness of program components and their interrelatedness.

Since the RESEA program was permanently authorized in 2018, the Department has directed states to use evidence-based interventions where they exist, identify areas where more evidence is needed, and to begin RESEA evaluations no later than FY 2021. Given evaluations of the permanently authorized RESEA program are still in progress, the Department and states continue to use research conducted on RESEA's predecessor, REA, to inform RESEA program and evaluation design. In February 2020, the Department's Chief Evaluation Office (CEO) released the final study report for the Evaluation of the REA Program, an implementation and impact study conducted from 2014-2019.¹² The Evaluation of the REA Program's impact study is one of the largest evaluations of a social program ever successfully conducted and was designed to provide considerable new information about the impacts of the REA program, including program components, which previous studies were too small to detect. With significant findings, this study offers compelling insights into the effectiveness of the REA program in reducing UC duration and increasing employment and earnings outcomes, more so than any other study conducted to date.

¹¹ For more details on how causal evidence ratings of RESEA intervention effectiveness are determined, please see Appendix A. For references for the studies counted in Exhibit 1, please see Appendix B.

¹² In FY 2015, The Department introduced the RESEA grant program. RESEA was designed to replace REA, and its structure incorporates many elements of the REA program. The four states participating in the study continued to deliver the REA program and then transitioned to RESEA once their random assignment was complete (approximately April 2016).

The Evaluation of the REA Program was conducted by CEO's independent contractor, Abt Associates, and its impact study addressed three research questions:

- What was the overall impact of the REA program – on UC duration, employment, and earnings?
- How did that impact vary with claimant characteristics?
- What was the role of the different components of the program in achieving those impacts? In particular, what was the relative role of:
 - Assistance to UC claimants in their search for a new job;
 - Enforcement of ongoing eligibility requirements for the UI program, including the requirement to search for work; and
 - The procedural requirement to attend the in-person REA meeting, where any assistance and enforcement were delivered.

To address these research questions, the evaluation team worked with Indiana, New York, Washington, and Wisconsin to randomly assign nearly 300,000 UC claimants in a multi-armed random assignment study design. The study relied solely on REA program administrative data from states and wage record data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service's Office of Child Support Enforcement's National Directory of New Hires (NDNH). Below is a summary of key findings, which are discussed in greater detail in the project's reports¹³:

- REA's Impact on UC Duration and Earnings:
 - REA cuts duration of UI, on average, by about 1.3 weeks, and raises employment and earnings by a small amount. About half of the drop in UC duration is due to an increase in employment; the other half is increased time during which the claimants are not receiving UC and not employed.
- How Impacts Vary with Claimant Characteristics:
 - Pooling across the states, the study found that REA cut UC duration more than twice as much for claimants whose earnings were "low" (below the median) in the year prior to the claim as it did for claimants whose previous year earnings were "high" (above the median).
 - REA also cut UC duration more for younger claimants (those whose age was below the median).
- Role of REA's Components in Achieving Impacts:
 - Both REA's enforcement and assistance have impacts on UI duration. Most of the impact comes from enforcement of the procedural requirement to attend the REA meeting; some of the impact comes from the assistance with job search and referrals to reemployment services provided at the REA meeting; and little of the impact comes from enforcement of the UI program's ongoing eligibility requirements, including the requirement to search for work.

¹³ For more information on the Department's Evaluation of the REA Program, please see the [*Evaluation of Impacts of the Reemployment and Eligibility \(REA\) Program: Final Report, the Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment \(REA\) Impact Study: Implementation Report*](#), and other reports from the project on the Department's Chief Evaluation Office Completed Reports web page: <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies>.

REA interventions are considered low intensity, involving at most a few hours of group engagement and a few hours of one-on-one counseling. As such, the REA program has a low direct cost (about \$100/UC claimant) and generally would not be expected to generate large impacts. However, given the low cost of the intervention, large impacts are not needed for the program to pass the cost-effective test; the study observed that the decrease in UC (about \$350/UC claimant selected) and the increase in earnings (about \$470/UC claimant) are larger than the cost of the REA program. More formal cost-benefit analyses could further explore these types of return-on-investment issues.

Because of its large size, the Department's Evaluation of the REA Program's new impact study also offers methodological insights, particularly about how to detect impacts in REA programs that are low cost and low intensity. Perhaps most importantly, the study confirmed that studying REA, and its successor program RESEA, requires large samples, and offers some general estimates of sample sizes needed to detect impacts on UC duration, employment and earnings, and of program components. It found that extremely large samples, perhaps even larger than those in the Evaluation of the REA Program's impact study, are required to detect some impacts. For example, this study found that its sample sizes were large enough to distinguish how impacts on UC duration vary with certain claimant characteristics, but – even with a sample of nearly 300,000 – were not large enough to distinguish how impacts on employment or earnings vary. Studies with even larger sample sizes could detect even smaller labor market impacts that may be present.

C. Building additional evidence on promising interventions.

Despite its similarities to REA, the RESEA program is a different program that has greater flexibility and range in both the selection of participants and types of services provided. Because of this, new evidence beyond evaluations of the REA program and other established promising reemployment interventions is needed. Additionally, the effectiveness of interventions evolves over time to reflect changing economic and labor market conditions. For these reasons, states participating the RESEA program are expected to help contribute to the growth and maintenance of the evidence base needed to support the tiered-evidence program.

To support building of the RESEA evidence base, the Department is conducting an RESEA Evidence Building and Implementation Study.¹⁴ The project's independent contractor, Abt Associates, with partners, the Urban Institute, Capital Research Corporation, and the National Association of State Workforce Agencies, is conducting an implementation study of RESEA programs, developing options to advance the RESEA evidence base, and providing evaluation technical assistance to states to build the RESEA evidence base. This project will answer key research questions about the new RESEA program, including:

- What is the current state of the evidence of RESEA and its components?
- What are the existing gaps in the RESEA evidence base?

¹⁴ Additional details on the Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessments Evidence Building and Implementation Study can be found on the Department's Chief Evaluation Office Current Studies web page at: <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/currentstudies/Reemployment-Services-and-Eligibility-Assessments-Research>

- How is RESEA being implemented?
- What program design options could help build evidence on RESEA interventions and fill existing gaps in the evidence base?

Emerging evidence from the Department’s RESEA implementation study indicate that states are undertaking a variety of approaches, regarding claimant selection methods, intensive services, and more.¹⁵ This new implementation study will identify components of states’ programs and shed light on how states vary in their approaches, including identifying approaches that seem especially promising. States will be able to use that information to both inform ongoing program development decisions and to identify interventions that new evaluations – including new impact evaluations – might examine. Over time, these new studies will build an evidence base that will help both the Department and states more precisely know which interventions are effective.

Additionally, new causal studies of RESEA program components could offer evidence about how the component parts of states’ RESEA interventions could be bundled in different ways that could help improve outcomes for UC claimants. Exhibit 2 provides an initial list of such potentially promising intervention components for which more evidence is needed, along with potential research questions.¹⁶ As more implementation and impact studies are completed, additional RESEA program components may come to light for future study.¹⁷

Exhibit 2. RESEA Potential Promising Interventions in Need of Expanded Evidence

Component	Sub-component	Specific Evidence to Build
Selecting Claimants and Scheduling Meetings	Claimant Selection Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What selection approach (if any) identifies claimants that will be most favorably affected by RESEA selection?
	Timing of Claimant Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it better to select claimants as soon as possible (i.e., after the first payment has been made) or later in the life of the claim?

¹⁵ Final findings from the Department’s RESEA Evidence Building and Implementation Study will be available in about late fall 2021 on the Department’s Chief Evaluation Office [Completed Reports](https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies) web page: <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies>.

¹⁶ A more complete list of RESEA program components that require more evidence to-date can be found in Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 01-20: https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=6691

¹⁷ Some of the RESEA intervention components in Exhibit 2 may be easier to build evidence around than others due to the “size” of the intervention. For example, “larger” components like reemployment services may require smaller samples to identify impacts on UC duration and employment than “smaller” components like the timing of claimant selection. If a study’s sample is too small, it risks being underpowered to detect impacts that may actually be present. However, even studies examining larger RESEA components will require large samples. Additional discussion of sample size issues may be found in the *REA Impact Study Brief: Methodological Insights* brief at: <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/evaluation/pdf/REA%20Impact%20Study%20Briefs%20-%20Methodological%20Insights.pdf>, and in other RESEA evaluation technical assistance resources.

Component	Sub-component	Specific Evidence to Build
	Scheduling RESEA Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How soon after claimant selection should RESEA meetings be required to occur? • What is the effect of having multiple RESEA meetings, rather than just one?
Reemployment Activities	Reemployment services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the impact of “basic” assistance (e.g., American Job Center orientation, self-directed use of online tools, general labor market information) vs. the impact of more intensive, individualized career services? • What are effective strategies for delivering job search assistance? • Are there types of work-based training that can help get individuals to work quickly (e.g., on-the-job training, apprenticeship)? • What is the effect of different case management strategies (e.g., increased frequency of intensive case management)? • What strategies are most effective to support development of a reemployment plan that the claimant “owns” and implements?
	Activities to support work search compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do the strength, immediacy, and surety of penalties for failure to attend affect job search efforts and outcomes?

D. Next steps for the Department and states to identify, develop, and evaluate other potentially promising interventions.

Section 306(d)(2), SSA, permits states to spend up to 10 percent of their annual RESEA grant funds to conduct or cause to be conducted evaluations of interventions used in their RESEA programs. However, due to the economic effects of COVID-19 and the related impact on RESEA operations, many planned evaluation activities during FY 2020 were delayed, postponed, or modified.

To support states’ efforts to reopen and restore their state and local economies, the Department provided resources and strongly encouraged states operating RESEA programs to develop or expand the availability of remote and virtual services. In response, many states modified RESEA services during FY 2020 by introducing alternative approaches to service delivery when in-person meetings were not possible. It is anticipated that many of these modifications will be continued into FY 2021 and, to some extent, may become permanent components of states’ RESEA programs.

In its FY 2021 RESEA operations guidance, the Department established the expectation that states that did not begin evaluations in FY 2020 must do so in FY 2021, and the Department is providing all states with an opportunity to revise their evaluation plans to reflect their current RESEA program designs.

To assist states in planning their RESEA-related evaluations, the Department identified three steps states are encouraged to follow to help ensure their RESEA impact evaluations are well-positioned to meet CLEAR's causal evidence standards for high or moderate quality studies:

1. Use an academically rigorous design with comparison groups, like random assignment;
2. Identify and produce a large enough sample, so the results are statistically significant (this might involve partnering with other states in a consortium to pool samples if a state serves a smaller number of claimants, or extending study timelines beyond about 4 years); and
3. Work with an experienced independent evaluator with no direct or indirect responsibility for program administration or operations. An experienced evaluator can help a state select and implement an appropriate impact evaluation design to answer its research questions and obtain an appropriate sample size.

The Department recognizes the significant challenges in standing up large new studies like the recently completed Evaluation of the REA Program's impact study (mentioned above) and general complexities in conducting evaluations. For example, all states will need to navigate sample-size challenges (particularly those with moderate to small-sized RESEA programs); all states must develop or modify current data-use agreements to allow evaluators access to necessary UI and other data; states may need to respond to unforeseen changes in RESEA operations resulting from economic changes or other factors, such as the recent and ongoing response to the COVID-19 pandemic; and states will need to navigate independent evaluator selection, procurement, and other technical aspects of conducting evaluations which may be new to them.

To support states, the Department has been providing generalized evaluation technical assistance (evaluation TA) to all states since 2019. These evaluation TA efforts include engaging with independent evaluation experts under the RESEA Evidence Building and Implementation Study to develop and deliver technical assistance that supports states' ability to build new RESEA evidence. To the greatest extent possible, the RESEA evaluation TA resources build on existing evaluation technical assistance resources, such as those developed for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and focus particularly on knowledge required for evaluations of RESEA interventions that can meet the evidence standards discussed earlier. This ongoing evaluation TA includes a series of webinars (16 at the time of this report) about key evaluation concepts; question-and-answer sessions; plain language resources; a FAQ; an evaluation toolkit; and a RESEA Help Line for specific RESEA evaluation questions.¹⁸

Additionally, the Department is providing customized evaluation TA to five states as part of a learning cohort that will operate until fall 2023. The Department's goal for the learning cohort is to help participating states conduct the highest quality impact evaluations feasible to learn about their RESEA

¹⁸ RESEA evaluation and evidence resources are available on WorkforceGPS's Reemployment Connections webpage at: https://rc.workforcegps.org/resources/~/link.aspx?_id=472F42AAE3FD4A159CBCC374AAA36CCB&z=z

programs. Each state has been assigned an evaluation TA liaison who is supporting states in specific evaluation activities, such as: securing an evaluator; designing states' RESEA impact evaluation; beginning to conduct states' impact evaluations; planning for analyzing evaluation data; and preparing to document impact study findings. States selected for participation in the learning cohort have demonstrated readiness to begin conducting impact studies now and have moderately-large sized RESEA programs. It is anticipated that each selected state will conduct impact studies of either its "whole" RESEA program or a component of the program in the coming years.

Finally, the Department's RESEA Evidence Building and Implementation Study is developing a report, informed by the current state of the evidence and the project's new implementation study, on future evidence building options that states and/or the Department may undertake to continue building needed evidence for the RESEA program.¹⁹

RESEA's Contributions to the Public Workforce System.

As an entry-point to the public workforce system to over a million unemployed individuals each year, the RESEA program is an important tool for states, local areas, and UC claimants, especially in the context of current economic recovery efforts. By design, RESEA is intended to supplement rather than supplant other public workforce programs and to serve as a catalyst for increased collaboration across workforce and UI programs. Successful implementation of RESEA requires states to adopt enrollment policies, leverage resources, share data, and integrate services in a manner that aligns and promotes the vision of WIOA and Department's *One Workforce* vision and strategy.²⁰ Additionally, as authorized, the RESEA program provides states with significant opportunity for innovation in program design and targeting UC claimants for participation, and it rewards new and innovative interventions. By building states' capacity to conduct high quality evaluations and driving the development of a continuously evolving evidence-base of promising and proven reemployment assistance interventions, RESEA is incentivizing evidence-based program design and positioning itself as a valuable resource and partner across workforce programs serving dislocated workers and other job seekers.

¹⁹ Final reports from the Department's RESEA Evidence Building and Implementation Study will be available in about late fall 2021 on the Department's Chief Evaluation Office [Completed Reports](https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies) web page: <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies>.

²⁰ For more information about the WIOA vision see Training and Employment Guidance Letter 19-14 at: https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=7353. For more information about the One Workforce vision see Training and Employment Notice 13-20 at: https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=9721

Appendix A: Causal Evidence Ratings of RESEA Intervention Effectiveness

CLEAR assigns each intervention an RESEA intervention effectiveness rating, which is an indication of the extent to which available research demonstrates that the intervention is effective at improving UC and employment outcomes. There are four possible ratings, each defined below.

- **High:** Interventions receive a “high” causal evidence rating of intervention effectiveness if two or more credible studies (i.e., studies that have received a “high” or “moderate” rating of study quality from CLEAR, based on CLEAR’s causal evidence guidelines) have found significant favorable impacts on both the Employment and UC Duration outcome domains. That is, *each* of the studies must show that the intervention *both* reduced UC duration *and* improved employment outcomes in the second full quarter after the start of a UC claim. The requirement to improve employment outcomes can be met by either increasing the percent of claimants who are employed or by increasing average quarterly earnings, compared to a control group. These net impacts on UC and employment outcomes must each be statistically significant at the 5% level ($p < .05$).
- **Moderate:** Interventions that do not qualify for a “high” rating may receive a “moderate” causal evidence rating if at least one credible study has found a statistically significant favorable impact on employment, *and* one credible study has found a statistically significant favorable impact on UC duration. These findings for the two outcome domains may, but need not, come from the same study. These net impacts on UI and employment outcomes must be statistically significant at the 10% level ($p < .10$). The “moderate” rating still relies exclusively on findings from credible studies (i.e., those that receive a high or moderate rating of study quality in CLEAR).
- **Potentially Promising:** A potentially promising rating indicates that there is some suggestive evidence that an intervention may be effective. Such interventions are candidates for further evaluation that possibly would allow the intervention to qualify for a higher rating. For an intervention to qualify for a potentially promising causal evidence rating, there must be one impact study reviewed by CLEAR (regardless of the causal evidence rating it received)²¹ that has found significant favorable impacts on either employment *or* UC duration at the 10% level ($p < .10$).
- **No Rating:** All interventions that do not qualify for any of the three ratings above, receive no rating, regardless of the rating given by CLEAR for the quality of studies of that intervention. These may be interventions for which no impact studies have been conducted, interventions with

²¹ CLEAR also rates some studies as “low.” Low-rated studies are not used when considering whether an intervention is eligible for a high or moderate effectiveness rating. However, studies rated as low by CLEAR *can* contribute to a potentially promising rating. The “potentially promising” rating indicates that some suggestive evidence exists that an intervention might be effective. While evidence from a low rated study is not a strong basis for concluding that an intervention is effective, it can suggest that the intervention may be worth considering for more rigorous evaluation.

an impact study that have not been reviewed by CLEAR yet, or interventions whose studies have been reviewed by CLEAR but have not shown any favorable impacts.

As new evidence is produced on RESEA interventions – either on states’ whole RESEA programs or on specific components of those programs – CLEAR will identify causal studies in subsequent systematic evidence reviews, and provide reviews and ratings for both study quality and intervention effectiveness. The list of rated interventions may change over time and expand to include more highly defined promising reemployment interventions.

Appendix B: References for Reports of Studies Informing RESEA Intervention Ratings

Included here is a list of references for credible studies whose findings informed both the development of the Department's list of promising or potentially promising RESEA interventions as well as the RESEA intervention effectiveness ratings to-date. The body of relevant research is expected to expand as more credible, higher-quality impact studies of RESEA interventions are completed.

- Corson, W., & Haimson, J. (1996). *The New Jersey Unemployment Insurance Reemployment Demonstration Project: Six-year follow-up and summary report*. Revised edition. Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper 96-2. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.
- Benus, J., Poe-Yamagata, E., Wang, Y., & Blass, E. (2008). *Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment (REA) Study*. IMPAQ International. [http://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/Reemployment% 20and% 20Eligibility% 20Assessmen, 20](http://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/Reemployment%20and%20Eligibility%20Assessmen,20).
- Black, D. A., Smith, J. A., Berger, M. C., & Noel, B. J. (2003). Is the threat of reemployment services more effective than the services themselves? Evidence from random assignment in the UI system. *American economic review*, 93(4), 1313-1327
- Corson, W., Long, D., & Nicholson, W. (1985). *Evaluation of the Charleston Claimant Placement and Work Test Demonstration*. Department of Labor Unemployment Insurance Occasional Paper, 85(2), 1-113.
- Decker, P., Olsen, R., & Freeman, L. (2000). *Assisting Unemployment Insurance claimants: The long-term impacts of the Job Search Assistance Demonstration*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.
- Dickinson, K. P., Decker, P.T., Kreutzer, S. D., & West R. W. (1999). *Evaluation of worker profiling and reemployment services: Final report, research and evaluation report series. 99–D*. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Policy and Research.
- Johnson, T. R., & Klepinger, D. H. (1994). Experimental evidence on unemployment insurance work-search policies. *Journal of Human Resources*, 695-717.
- Klepinger, D., Johnson, T., & Joesch, J. (2002). Effects of Unemployment Insurance Work-Search Requirements: The Maryland Experiment. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 56(1), 3-22. doi:10.2307/3270646
- Poe-Yamagata, E., Benus, J., Bill, N., Carrington, H., Michaelides, M., & Shen, T. (2011). Impact of the reemployment and eligibility assessment (REA) initiative. *ETA occasional paper*, 8.

- Michaelides, M., & Mueser, P. (2016). The labor market effects of U.S. reemployment programs during the Great Recession. (Working paper 08-2015). Nicosia, Cyprus: University of Cyprus, Department of Economics.
- Behrens, J. (1987). Evaluation of the perceivable demand list pilot project. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Department of Labor
- Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations. (1984). Wisconsin Job Service: ERP Pilot Project final report. Madison, WI: DILHR.
- Bloom, H. (1990). Back to work: Testing reemployment services for displaced workers. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.